



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

De Scholiis in Apollonium Rhodium Quaestiones Selectae.  
Dissertatio Inauguralis quam scripsit LUDOVICUS DEICKE.  
Gottingae MDCCCCI.

This dissertation deserves more notice than it has received during the years that have passed since its publication. It was one of the last, perhaps the very last piece of work of this sort to receive the approval of the late Professor Kaibel. The discussion of Dr. Deicke is important partly for what it is, partly for what it promises, by implication if not expressly. In order to give the right point of view, the following prefatory remarks are made.

1. The scholia to Apollonius of Rhodes are to be reckoned as among the most important ancient commentaries. Here are preserved many fragments of poets, historians, geographers, and besides, much valuable wreckage of ancient learning. 2. A definitive text of this important commentary is not yet in existence. A glance backward will show the situation. The scholia first appeared in print in 1496, in a Florentine edition of the *Argonautica*. This form, which was long the only form in use, we may refer to as Fl. Through Ruhnken's influence, a different recension of the scholia, as found in a Paris manuscript, was published by Schaefer. The second volume of the second edition of Brunck's *Argonautica*, Leipzig, 1813, contains these two bodies of scholia, Fl and P. Scholars of the following period referred not to any one text of the scholia but to these two forms. 3. A new and a third period began with the edition of Keil, in 1854. This edition was based entirely on the famous Codex Laurentianus, XXXII, 9, and was independent of Fl and P. Keil maintained that here was the authoritative text. He was convinced that L, as we may call it, is anterior to Fl and P; that whatever is good in Fl and P came from L; that whatever in Fl and P is not referable to L is worthless. There is so much truth in Keil's position that he carried conviction almost universally. L is undoubtedly a better and a purer tradition than any other. But it has gradually become clear that Keil's theory is not adequate. It has been shown by a comparison of L, Fl and P that sometimes the last two have the right of it as against the first. No great progress, however, could be expected, by this method alone. At best, it taught circumspection in the use of the scholia. 4. The hope of progress must lie in the accession of new material. If it be true that Fl and P are not derived from L, but that, rather, all three converge at a point still further back, then one must work toward this point of convergence; one must try to ascend the main stream, before it parted to flow into the lesser channels that we now know, L, Fl, P. 5. The grammatical tradition which is richly precipitated in the scholia Apolloniana is not found here

alone. It is in evidence in the *Etymologicum Magnum*. Keil occasionally used this aid in emending the text, but not thoroughly. Various investigations have shown that the notes in E. M. are drawn from a richer and fuller form of the scholia than what we now possess. In other words, they go back to that main stream to which reference has been made. They go back to it, not directly, but through intermediate channels which may often be traced.

At length we have reached the vital part of Dr. Deicke's work. In conducting his investigation he has had access to new material. *Etymologicum Magnum* is no longer first in rank. There is an *Etymologicum Genuinum*, which is a parallel yet distinct work. Just as L is a better form of the scholia than Fl and P, so E. Gen. is better than E. M. Unfortunately we have to be content with fragmentary knowledge of this new source. The state of the case is as follows.

In 1868, E. Miller published in *Mélanges de Littérature Grecque* certain extracts from a Laurentian MS of an etymological work that was entitled *Etymologicum Magnum*, and yet was in important respects different. In 1890, Reitzenstein began to give supplementary information, based upon a Vatican MS., concerning this same work; at first, in the *Indices Lectionum* of Rostock University, later, in his *Geschichte der Griechischen Etymologika*, Leipzig, 1897. These two manuscripts, the Laurentian and the Vatican, prove the existence of an etymological work that is older and, in the main, fuller than E. M. In fact, the compiler of E. M. has used this work. Reitzenstein who is in effect the discoverer of the new work has named it, in recognition of its priority, *Etymologicum Genuinum*. A principal distinction of E. Gen. is the greater frequency with which the sources are cited; and these are not merely the grammarians and compilers but sometimes writers of the earlier period. No edition of E. Gen. has appeared. Reitzenstein has published specimens. Miller's extracts are based upon one only of the two manuscripts.

Dr. Deicke in conducting his investigation has had the advantage of using unpublished material from E. Gen. He stands therefore upon a vantage ground. His dissertation deals, in three chapters, with the relation of the three corpora L, Fl and P to each other, with the collateral testimony furnished by the *Etymologica*, and with the constituent elements of the scholia, particularly with those elements that go back, respectively, to Theon, Lucillus, Irenaeus and Sophocles, with the periphrases and the lexical notes. The important mythographical and geographical material is reserved by the author for future treatment.

A review of an abstruse discussion like this of Dr. Deicke is of most service if it states conclusions, leaving the details for the worker in that special field. Broadly speaking the conclusions may be put as follows: 1. In using the Scholia to Apollonius one must reckon with the possibility of working back to an earlier

and a fuller form than any one that now exists in the several forms, L, Fl, P. The latest editor of the fragments of Corinna, (Crönert, Rh. Mus. LXIII, 165, f.) proposes a reading based upon this method. 2. The resources of E. Gen. are a new and an important help toward determining this earlier and fuller form. Dr. Deicke has made this particular application of Reitzenstein's discovery and has pointed the way for further progress. 3. A new edition of the scholia is needed, prepared along the lines that are marked out by Dr. Deicke. On p. 23 of the dissertation the problem is stated. The new edition is, as it were, foreshadowed. I understand upon good authority that Dr. Deicke undertook the work, with the cooperation of Reitzenstein and others, and that he has brought it some distance on its way. It is to be hoped that the plan will be carried to its completion. The field is a difficult one. To till it properly demands much self-denying labor. But Dr. Deicke is called to that work, and there are not a few who look forward with hope and expectation to its accomplishment.

In conclusion, one reading of E. Gen. is here cited, partly to illustrate in one matter of detail how the new source brings certitude, partly to supplement my review of the Oxford edition of the *Argonautica*, A. J. Ph. XXII 330. In discussing the reading *πρώραν ἔσω*, I 372, I gave reasons for preferring Bergk's *πρώειραν ἔσω*. Bergk's proposal was an inference from a note in E. M. 692, 35. The testimony of E. Gen. makes inference unnecessary by an explicit statement and by citing the verse:

*πρώειρα: διὰ τοῦ εἰρα, ὡς παρὰ Ἀπολλωνίῳ  
οἱ δὲ κατὰ πρώειραν ἔσω ἄλός.*

There can therefore be no further question about the true reading of the verse. Bergk's emendation stands.

EDWARD FITCH.

HAMILTON COLLEGE, CLINTON, N. Y.

Hermes und die Toten. Von S. EITREM, Christiania, 1909.

"Hermes was worshipped wherever the dead were buried", says Professor S. Eitrem in his *Hermes und die Toten*. The primitive Greeks, as is proved by the excavations at Orchomenos, Thorikos, and elsewhere, and the stories of Heroes' graves within temples, buried their dead within the house, and these dead became "Eine Gewähr ihres Wohlergehens". The custom of human sacrifice at the building of a new house, and, perhaps, at the erection of an altar, is to be explained by this necessity of procuring a protecting spirit. The same ideas led